

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	GANGWAL <i>et al.</i>	Examiner:	Treat, William M.
Serial No.:	10/568,013	Group Art Unit:	2181
Filed:	February 10, 2006	Docket No.:	NL030979US1 (NXPS.469PA)
Allowed:	January 13, 2010	Confirmation No.:	2298
Title:	PARALLEL PROCESSING ARRAY		

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Customer No. 65913

Dear Sir:

The Examiner's statement for allowance could be construed to imply that the claimed invention was allowed because the references of record did not disclose certain aspects of the claimed invention. The characterized aspects, however, if indeed could be found in the prior art, would not render the claimed invention invalid under §102 because the claimed invention includes a number of other limitations. With respect to §103, the rigors of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness include not only showing that the prior art teaches the entire claimed invention (all limitations are to be considered), but also that combining the various prior art references is suggested in the art or that there would be motivation to make the combination. The reasons provided do not appear to be necessarily inconsistent herewith.

Applicant also acknowledges the Examiner's lengthy discussion provided in the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance. For example as noted therein, the Kleihorst reference includes at least one author who is also a named inventor of the instant application. Consistent with the prosecution history of the instant application and the Notice of Allowance, it

is believed that the subject matter set forth in the claims is sufficiently different than that which was disclosed in the Kleihorst reference. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's careful scrutiny of the cited references and other related searching conducted by the Patent Examiner, and the Patent Examiner's conclusion that the claims should be allowed over this prior art in the form of a U.S. Letters Patent.

Unless Applicant hears otherwise, Applicant's comments herein are, as intended, clarifying in a manner consistent with the law.

Dated: April 9, 2010

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Patent Counsel
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131

CUSTOMER NO. 65913

By: 

Robert J. Crawford
Reg. No.: 32,122
(NXPS.469PA)